DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 168 724 PS 010 500

TITLE	Where Are the Children? Report of a National Survey of Out-of-State Placement Arrangements.
INSTITUTION	New York State Council of Voluntary Child Care Agencies, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Mar 78
NOTE	77p.
AVAILABLE FROM	New York State Council of Voluntary Child Care Agencies, 104 East 35th Street, New York, New York 10016 ($3.00, including postage)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Responsibility; Agency Role; Centralization; *Child Welfare; Data Collection; *Exceptional Child Services; *National Surveys; Recordkeeping; Research; State Action; State Standards; *Youth
IDENTIFIERS	*Administrative Procedures

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this survey was to identify procedures and practices of child welfare and related agencies of each state in the United States regarding out-of-state placement of children and reception of non-resident children for therapeutic, educational, physical and psychiatric services. An overall view emphasizing functions and responsibilities of state governments rather than specific statistical data was sought. The survey instrument (a two-part questionnaire) was not intended to be an evaluative research instrument. Forty of the 50 states responded. Major findings are summarized. Twenty-eight of the states reported they do not have a central unit that makes evaluations of out-of-state facilities. Limited information indicated that "emotional disturbance" was the most frequent classification of children placed out-of-state with "socially maladjusted" the second most frequent classification. The major conclusion of the study is that very few states have centralized information about either their procedures for placing children out-of-state or the children placed out. The same is true for non-resident children received. Placement coordination, evaluating and monitoring, centralization of approved facility registries and improved record keeping are among the recommendations made. Questionnaire and results are appended. (Author/RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED168724

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

WHERE ARE THE CHILDREN?

Report of a National Survey of Out-of-State Placement Arrangements

March, 1978

PS 010500

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Joseph B. Gavarin
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

NEW YORK STATE COUNCIL OF VOLUNTARY CHILD CARE AGENCIES
104 East 35th Street, New York, N. Y. 10016 (212) 683-6000
176 Washington Avenue, Albany, N. Y. 12210 (518) 463-2348

This survey has been conducted, and the results published, as part of NYSCOVCCA's coordinating efforts to improve services for children. Any portion of the survey, or of the conclusions, may be quoted or reproduced by other concerned groups or advocacy organizations if an appropriate credit line to NYSCOVCCA is included.

Additional copies may be ordered from NYSCOVCCA at $3.00 each (including postage).

Table of Contents

	Page
Foreword	1
Introduction	3
Summary of Findings	4
Conclusions and Recommendations	7
Report of Results of Survey	9
Appendix I: Data by State not Adaptable to Statistical Analysis	
Appendix II: Survey Instrument	

Acknowledgements

The survey and this report were formulated with the invaluable insights, suggestions and editorial skills of Joseph B. Gavrin, Executive Director, and Janet W. Bajan, Associate for Public Policy at the New York State Council of Voluntary Child Care Agencies. Without their input this project would never have come to fruition. Thanks also is due to Margaret Kilduff, Rutgers Graduate School of Social Work, New Brunswick, New Jersey, for assistance with computer services. The support staff at NYSCVOCCA deserves credit for their usual excellent services employed in the production of this work, particularly Beverly Slomka.

Adeline Bliven

Out-of-State Placement Report

FOREWORD

The New York State Council of Voluntary Child Care Agencies is a membership organization whose 121 agencies care for more than 85% of the children in foster care in New York City and provide approximately 50% of all foster care in New York State. Our agencies serve not only troubled and court related youth in campus residence programs and group living arrangements, but also dependent, neglected, disturbed, retarded and abused children in foster boarding homes and other alternate living arrangements. Adoption services, planning for permanency, day care, day treatment and efforts designed to preserve family unity or reunite separated families are included.

Although the voluntary child welfare sector is caring for an increasingly difficult population, there is still a tiny percentage of New York State children requiring care (about 2%) for whom neither voluntary nor public facilities feel themselves equipped. These are the seriously emotionally disturbed, the seriously acting out, sometimes the delinquent child with multiple other problems, sometimes the seriously multiply handicapped. These are the children whom a number of state and local agencies send to other than child welfare facilities in various parts of New York State or to a wide assortment of different facilities in other states across the country. It is estimated there are at least 800 New York State children in placement outside the State.

Recently, attention has been focused on this small but unusual group of children. Questions raised include: why is it necessary to send all or even some of these children out-of-state for care, some as far away as 1,500 miles? Why can a facility in another state sometimes be paid a very large sum for caring for such children, but in-state facilities can be given no such recompense for providing specialized services? How is it that agencies out-of-state do not have to meet the same standards as those in New York? What procedures are used when placing children out-of-state? Do we really know how many children are presently placed out-of-state and by whom? Information on this issue is not centralized in New York State and no overall system is utilized in making placements outside the State.

These and other questions and problems led key people in public and voluntary agencies and the Legislature to try to define the dimensions of the problem and develop solutions. Last year a bill was introduced in the Assembly to establish an Out-of-State Placement Bureau to oversee such placements. While the bill did not pass in 1977, it now has undergone further amendment and will be seriously considered for passage this session.

NYSCOVCCA has followed with interest and concern the thinking and developments in this area. When it came time for our student intern from the Rutgers University School of Social Work, Adeline Bliven, to do her term project, it was mutually agreed by Adel, by our Executive Director, Joe Gavrin, and myself, that a study on the out-of-state placement issue would be timely and relevant. New York State's attempt to turn its non-system into a system prompted us to wonder just how other states handle this situation. It was decided the study would be a survey of all the

other states (including the District of Columbia) with regard to the available information on their children in out-of-state placements and the system or procedures they followed in making such placements. Our goal was to centralize hitherto uncollected information on the subject. Our overall finding is that New York State's situation is the norm and not the exception.

NYSCOVCCA is intimately interested in the fate of these children. Some have already passed through our agencies, although many have been the responsibility of mental hygiene, educational, retardation or other specialized facilities. If the trend to return these children to their home state continues, many will be referred to the voluntary sector. Proper care for these children in either the public or voluntary sector will require greater financial and programmatic commitment to in-New York State facilities than now exists. We hope the information detailed in this report will act as a spur to New York in its quest for a rational way to deal with this problem, and will expedite the necessary financial and programmatic commitments. We believe the information also will be useful to other states and wish to thank them for their help and cooperation.

Janet W. Bajan
Associate for Public Policy

February 14, 1978

Introduction

There has been increasing concern in New York State about procedures and practices in its child welfare and related systems that have resulted in substantial numbers of children being placed in agencies in other states for therapeutic, educational, physical and psychiatric services. This survey sought to gather data from all states on their procedures when seeking such services for children outside their borders. Data on procedures was also requested from states acting in the reciprocal position of receiving such children who came from outside their borders.

The survey sought information regarding the structures in the state system operational in placement of children out-of-state and in reception of non-resident children. An overall view was sought emphasizing functions and responsibilities of state governments rather than specific statistical data.

General information sought included: 1) participation in and utilization of the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children, 2) allocation of responsibility for approval of placement of children in child care facilities in states in which they are non-residents, 3) utilization and location of registries of these children and the functions of the registries, 4) allocation of responsibility for evaluating and monitoring facilities accepting non-resident children and the methods used, 5) allocation of responsibility for on-going casework with the children placed and 6) mechanisms for payments for services purchased.

The survey also requested the number of children placed out-of-state by handicapping condition and by length of time in placement. Information regarding the participation of voluntary and proprietary agencies in placement of these children was also sought. An assessment by the states of their procedures in these types of placement was requested along with their plans for change.

The survey instrument was a two part questionnaire. Part I was concerned with procedures covering placement of children in facilities ouside of a state's borders. Part II covered procedures and responsibilities of states receiving non-resident children into facilities within the state. (See Appendix II for survey instrument.) The survey instrument was not intended to be an evaluative research instrument. Neither the format nor the manner of administration allows it to be considered as such. Therefore, there was no intent to apply statistical methods of analysis to the data received. The computations detailed are simple arithmetic averages based on each category of answer and the number of states responding.

We believe that an overall view of systems and procedures in the areas of information requested has been obtained and will be of value for states in making assessments and planning changes in their child welfare systems. We wish to thank the states that completed the questionnaire and cooperated with our efforts to gather information that may be of use in New York's thrust to improve the quality of care of all children in need of residential placement.

The states that responded to the survey are listed below:*

Alaska	Indiana	Montana	Pennsylvania
Arizona	Iowa	Missouri	Rhode Island
Arkansas	Kansas	Nebraska	South Carolina
California	Kentucky	Nevada	Tennessee
Colorado	Louisiana	New Hampshire	Utah
Delaware	Maine	New Jersey	Vermont
Georgia	Maryland	New Mexico	Virginia
Hawaii	Massachusetts	North Carolina	Washington
Idaho	Michigan	Oklahoma	Wisconsin
Illinois	Minnesota	Oregon	Wyoming

Summary of Findings:

1) Thirty-one states responded that they are a party to the Interstate Compact on Placement of Children (ICPC). Nine responded as non-participants. According to the American Public Welfare Association (APWA) 41 states are covered by the ICPC. A check of the states the APWA listed as participating indicates one state responding erroneously. Therefore, of the states responding, 32 or 80% are party to ICPC and 8 states, 20% are not. The majority of the 40 states responding utilize the Compact. Only 6 do not utilize it in placing children in out-of-state facilities and 7 do not utilize it when arranging for return of children. Several states not party to the Compact indicated they used the procedures in their arrangements. Six states reported that all placements of children in out-of-state facilities are made only through their ICPC unit. The majority of states in the reciprocal position of receiving non-resident children reported they utilize the ICPC in their reception procedures.

2) Roughly one-half of the states reported they have a central unit responsible for approving all out-of-state placements. However, some of the states indicating use of a central unit also indicated they had other units of government with autonomy to make placements. Thus, existence of a central approval unit did not appear to guarantee that all cases would be processed by such a unit. Only 4 states reported that all placements were approved by a central unit with no other departments placing children autonomously. Twelve states reported that their Social Services, Education, Mental Health and Mental Retardation Departments and Juvenile Court all place children on an autonomous basis. Reciprocally, reception of non-resident

* Forty out of a possible fifty states responded. Washington D.C. (which did not respond) was included in the survey; New York was not. West Virginia responded too late to be included in the report.

children in facilities within a state is approved by a central unit in 24 (60%) of the states responding.

3) Of 36 states responding, 23 indicated that voluntary agencies make placements of children in out-of-state facilities. Of 26 states responding, 9 indicated that proprietary agencies make such placements.

4) The great majority of states responding reported accepting non-resident children into voluntary and proprietary facilities rather than public facilities.

5) Of 40 states responding 14 reported a central registry of children placed in out-of-state facilities. Of the 14, 12 reported these registries monitor appropriateness of placement, 13, length of placement and 12, planning for return of children.

6) Data revealed that 30 state social services departments maintain registries of children they place out-of-state. Many states failed to complete the rest of the question (#10, Part I) regarding registries in other state departments. However, 11 states reported registries maintained by the Juvenile Courts. Reciprocally, for non-resident children received in facilities within a state, 24 states said they did not maintain a central registry of these children, 14 reported they did have a central registry.

7) Approximately one-half of the 40 states responding answered "unknown" or "no answer" to the request for numbers of children placed by handicapping condition. This would appear to indicate a lack of centralized information on the numbers of children placed out-of-state and the reasons for their placement.

8) Limited information indicates "emotional disturbance" as the most frequent classification of children placed out-of-state with "socially maladjusted" the second most frequent classification.

9) Few states were able to give data on the length of time children were in out-of-state placements. Approximately 60% of the states responding answered "unknown" or "no answer." Data from 13 states indicated that the largest number of children, 221, were in placement more than 3 years. However, 149 of these children were reported by one state.* The next largest frequency was 172 children from 14 states who were in placement less than one year, which appears to be the most typical length of placement.

10) The majority of the states, 28 out of 40 responding, reported they do not have a central unit that makes evaluations of out-of-state facilities. Evaluations were done most frequently by Social Service Departments. The remainder of the question regarding other departments making evaluations yielded little data. Approximately 23 states, 57.5%, answered "unknown" or "no answer." Five of 16 states responding reported the Education Department making evaluations. Approximately 4 out of 13 states responding indicated Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Juvenile Court also evaluate out-of-state facilities.

---

* Massachusetts

11) The majority of states indicate comprehensive evaluation of out-of-state residential facilities. However, 5 states reported verification of licensing of the facility in its own state as their only evaluation procedure.

12) One-half of the states indicated they kept a registry of evaluated and approved out-of-state facilities. Only 8 states out of 38 responding indicated they had a list or registry of facilities within their states that accepted out-of-state children.

13) Data indicates that, in general, the departments that have units which evaluate out-of-state facilities also monitor those facilities. Only 4 states reported that their central evaluation department also monitored the facilities. The manner in which the monitoring is done and the frequency of monitoring is quite diverse among the states and is reported under question 19, Part I.

14) The majority of states, 28 out of 38, reported they did not have a single unit of government that made payments to out-of-state facilities for services rendered. Payments are made by the departments making the placements in 33 states.

15) Most states indicated similar procedural requirements to be fulfilled before approval would be given for an out-of-state placement. States also reported a variety of "other" requirements before allowing children to be placed out-of-state (see question 23, Part I). These requirements indicate strong efforts to place children in facilities in their home states. It would appear that placements out-of-state occur because of lack of adequate resources for "very special needs" children.

16) Provisions for visits by the children to their homes and for visits by parents to the children in placement were reported by the majority of the states. Payments for the transportation for both these types of visits were reported as paid for by the majority of states.

17) Twenty-two of 38 states said they were not satisfied with their systems on out-of-state placements. Fifty percent of states responding expressed satisfaction with their arrangements for placement of out-of-state children in facilities within their states. Many changes and improvements are being planned by states and are reported in Appendix I.

18) Wide diversity is apparent in the assumption of responsibilities for non-resident children received in facilities within a state. The responsibilities range from establishing standards for licensing and functioning as a liaison with the sending state to supervision and monitoring of the placements by written reports. Casework services such as arrangements for travel, education and medical services and planning for return of the child are also responsibilities assumed by some states (see Appendix I). The most frequently reported assumed responsibilities were licensing and supervision and monitoring of the placements.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The major conclusion of this study is that very few states have centralized information on either their procedures for placing out-of-state or the children placed out-of-state. The same is true in situations where non-resident children are received into a state.

Data revealed that while the majority of states are party to the ICPC, very few states utilize it as a mechanism for control and accountability of placements of children in out-of-state facilities. In the majority of states, several or more departments in the child welfare and related systems, have autonomy and authority to place children in out-of-state residential facilities. Also, in most of the respondent states, voluntary agencies place autonomously, and proprietary agencies do so in 9 of the states.

On the basis of these conclusions, we recommend that those states party to the ICPC use it in sending and receiving children into placement. This means implementing, in fact, Article VII of the compact which provides that an officer be designated as "general coordinator of activities" under the compact. As minimal as this may seem, it still guarantees that one office has responsibility for coordinating efforts.

In the absence of this minimal requirement there is bound to be non-uniformity of standards and procedures governing placements. Cooperation and coordination between autonomous placing units is difficult to achieve in an ad hoc inter-agency fashion and thus is often very minimal. The effects of a multi-unit placement system can be ineffectiveness in terms of the quality and quantity of placements and inefficiency in human and monetary resources expended. More specifically, poor planning of placements, use of inadequate and inappropriate resources, underutilization of in-state resources and overutilization of out-of-state facilities are possibilities because of the lack of centralized information, decision-making and supervision.

Furthermore, in most states there is no coordinated system for evaluation and monitoring of facilities in-state and out-of-state that accept non-resident children. While a majority of respondent states indicated their Social Services Department made evaluations of facilities, these same states reported that other units of the social welfare system also made evaluations. Many states reported they did not know if other units made evaluations. Thus, the majority of states had no list or registry of approved and evaluated facilities for out-of-state placements, or for in-state placement of out-of-state children. This is another facet of the lack of centralized control of the placement of children outside their own states.

A second recommendation flowing from the findings is that states centralize registries of approved facilities in their ICPC office, thereby enabling all agencies to benefit from available information.

As noted in the summary of findings, very few states knew the number of the children they placed out-of-state or received into their state either in terms of total numbers, or, more specifically, by handicapping condition or length of time in placement. The majority of states reported they did not have a central registry of the children placed in out-of-state facilities, nor was there a central registry of out-of-state children placed in facilities within a state. States able to report at all on these issues indicated that children sent out-of-state or received into a state had

"very special needs," but without specificity as to what these needs were. If states themselves have no central registries on characteristics of these children, they can be in no position to determine if frequency of a type of child in their state warrants creation of a public or voluntary agency in-state to care for youngsters with a particular need or group of characteristics.

We therefore recommend that record keeping systems, computerized or manual, be instituted in states, designed to compare children in placement by service needs. There would thus be a method for determining numbers of children in service needs categories. States could then determine, in a unified fashion, how to provide services for children in any particular category. Such record keeping systems could also be designed to recall files for periodic check; thus length of time in placement would no longer be an "unknown" about so many children.

Finally, the survey indicated that most states reported no central mechanism for control of payments for services purchased from out-of-state facilities. Substantial sums of money are spent sending children to specialized facilities out-of-state. Centralizing this information would give a state the real figure as to such cost. We recommend such centralization. A state would then be in the position of deciding on the feasibility of using part or all of this money to provide specialized services within in-state facilities and keep all or many of the children closer to home.

It is not our position that all children can or ought to be cared for near their homes. We do believe, however, that there must be sufficient information and resources to enable proper placement decisions. It is clear from this survey that, even if resources are available, states do not know about them in an organized fashion. Neither do states know about their "children with special needs" population in an organized way. It is simplistic merely to say "bring them all home." We do say: organize your systems, centralize your information, put your financial accounts in order, study your home state resources and the feasibility of enriching some of these resources. Then you will be in a position to evaluate how many of the children can, in fact, be returned home and served by your own state's resources, or, at least, by programs maximally accessible to children and their families.

Report of Results of Survey*

Part I

		Number	Percentage
1.	Federal Interstate Compact on Placement of Children in other States:		
	Number of states participating in Compact	31	77.5%
	Number of states not particpating in Compact	9	22.5%
	No answer	0	0 %
	Totals	40	100.0%
2.	Federal Interstate Compact on Placement of Children in other States:		
	Number of states utilizing Compact in out-of-state placements	34	85.0%
	Number of states not utilizing Compact in out-of-state placements	6	15.0%
	No answer	0	0 %
	Totals	40	100.0%
3.	Federal Interstate Compact on Placement of Children in other States:		
	Number of states utilizing Compact in return of children	33	82.5%
	Number of states not utilizing Compact in return of children	7	17.5%
	No answer	0	0 %
	Totals	40	100.0%

* Several questions had the variable "unknown" as a choice of answer. These were tabulated under this category. However, "unknown" was hand-written by respondents for many of the other questions not offering this variable. These written "unknowns" were tabulated as a "no answer." All spaces for answers left blank were tabulated as "no answer."

For purposes of this report, questions with multiple rows (vertical) requiring answers were given alphabetical designations not indicated on the survey. For example:

Question #5	Yes	No
5A Social Services	___	___

(continued on next page)

4. Central unit responsible for approving all out-of-state placements:	Number	Percentage
Number of states with central unit	19	47.5%
Number of states without central unit	21	52.5%
No answer	0	0 %
Totals	40	100.0%

See Appendix I for names of central units and departments which administer the units:

5. Autonomous units making out-of-state placements:

	Number of States with certain units making placement		Number of States without such units making placement		No Answer		Total	
A. Social Service	19	47.5%	12	30.0%	8	20.0%	39	97.5%*
B. Education	14	35.0%	12	30.0%	13	32.5%	39	97.5%*
C. Mental Hygiene	16	40.0%	13	32.5%	10	25.0%	39	97.5%*
D. Mental Retardation	17	42.5%	12	30.0%	10	25.0%	39	97.5%*
E. Juvenile Court	16	40.0%	12	30.0%	11	27.5%	39	97.5%*
F. Other[f]	8	20.0%	___	___	32	80.0%	40	100.0%

*Questions 5A through 5E one state (2.5%) answered "not applicable"

[f]Other - Department of Youth Services, Department of Juvenile Corrections, Children's Bureau, Corrections. Some of these, or slight variations of these names, were reported by several states

(continued from note on previous page)

5B Education	___	___
5C Mental Hygiene	___	___
5D Mental Retardation	___	___
5E Juvenile Court	___	___
5F Other (specify)	___	___

6. Participation of voluntary agencies in out-of-state placements:

	Number	Percentage
Number of states in which voluntary agencies make placements	23	57.5%
Number of states in which voluntary agencies do not make placements	13	32.5%
No answer	4	10.0%
Totals	40	100.0%

7. Participation of proprietary agencies in out-of-state placements:

Number of states in which proprietary agencies make placements	9	22.5%
Number of states in which proprietary agencies do not make placements	17	42.5%
No answer	7	17.5%
Totals	33	82.5%*

*Seven states (17.5%) wrote in "not applicable" which may indicate a lack of proprietary agencies.

8. Central registry of children placed out-of-state:

Number of states with central registry	14	35.0%
Number of states without central registry	26	65.0%
No answer	0	0.0%
Totals	40	100.0%

See Appendix I for names of Central Registries

9. Monitoring responsibilities of central registry:

NOTE: The form of question 9 led to ambiguity relative to question #8. This data reflects information from only the states answering "yes" tc question #8 (14 states, 35.0%). All data from states answering "no" to question #8 was considered "not applicable" and not recorded (26 states, 65.0%).

	Number of States that monitor		Number of states that don't monitor		Total	
A. Appropriateness of placement	12	30.0%	2	5.0%	14	35.0%
B. Length of placement	13	32.5%	1	2.5%	14	35.0%
C. Planning for return of children	12	30.0%	2	5.0%	14	35.0%
D. Other*	4	10.0%	10	25.0%	14	35.0%

*Other - Treatment plans, progress reports, occasional visits, checking of "in-state" resources, costs. Some states reported one or more of the above or variations of them.

10. Departments maintaining registries of children placed out-of-state:

	Number of states with registries		Number of states without registries		No answer		Total	
A. Social Service	30	75.0%	7	17.5%	3	7.5%	40	100.0%
B. Education	5	12.5%	10	25.0%	21	52.5%	36	90.0%[b]
C. Mental Health	6	15.0%	10	25.0%	19	47.5%	35	87.5%[c]
D. Mental Retardation	9	22.5%	8	20.0%	19	47.5%	36	90.0%[d]
E. Juvenile Court	11	27.5%	6	15.0%	20	50.0%	37	92.5%[e]
F. Other*	6	15.0%	—	—	34	85.0%	40	100.0%

[b]Four states (10.0%) indicated "not applicable."
[c]Five states (12.5%) indicated "not applicable."
(continued on next page)

11. Non-public agencies maintaining registries of children placed out-of-state:

	Number of states with registries		Number of states without registries		No answer		Total	
A. Voluntary agencies	8	20.0%	5	12.5%	18	45.0%	31	77.5%[a]
B. Proprietary agencies	5	12.5%	7	17.5%	18	45.0%	30	75.0%[b]

[a]Nine states (22.5%) answered "not applicable."

[b]Ten states (25.0%) answered "not applicable."

(continued from question 10)
[d]Four states (10.0%) indicated "not applicable."
[e]Three states (7.5%) indicated "not applicable."

*Other - Exceptional Children's Act, Children's Services, Youth Services - 2 states, Interstate Compact Administration, Corrections.

12. Children in out-of-state placements by handicapping conditions:

NOTE: These figures are not representative of children in out-of-state placements by handicapping conditions. Approximately 50% of the states answered either unknown or not applicable for each of the categories. In addition, four states, accounting for 221 children, qualified their figures as applying to only one department of government, either Social Services, Mental Health, Welfare Division or Special and Rehabilitation Services.

	Number of Children	Number of States responding	Number of States responding unknown	Number of States responding not applicable	No answer	Total
A. Mental Retardation (below 80 I.Q.)	85	18	19	3	0	40
B. Physically Handicapped	35	19	19	2	0	40
C. Neurologically Handicapped	40	18	19	3	0	40
D. Emotionally Disturbed	900	21	18	1	0	40
E. Socially Maladjusted	178	19	19	2	0	40
F. Other*	68	6	—	—	34	40
F. Multiple Handicapped	58	18	20	2	0	40
	Total = 1364					

*Other - Delinquent (39), severely emotionally disturbed (1), learning disabled (3), Educationally Handicapped (14), Unspecified (10), Boarding school (1). Total = 68.

13. Length of time children are in out-of-state placements:

	Number of Children	Number of States responding	Number of States responding unknown	Number of States responding not applicable	No Answer	Total Number of states
A. Less than one year	172	14	13	1	12	40
B. Less than two years	156	15	11	1	13	40
C. Less than three years	35	14	11	2	13	40
D. More than three years	221	11	12	1	16	40
Total =	584					

14. Central unit for evaluation of all out-of-state facilities.

	Number	Percentage
Number of states with central unit	12	30.0%
Number of states without central unit	28	70.0%
No answer	0	0 %
Total	40	100.0%

See Appendix I for names of central units and the departments which administer the units.

15. Other departments making evaluations of out-of-state facilities:

	Number of states with evaluating departments		Number of states without evaluating departments		No answer		Total	
A. Social Service	26	65.0%	9	22.5%	5	12.5%	40	100.0%
B. Education	5	12.5%	11	27.5%	22	55.0%	38	95.0%[b]
C. Mental Health	4	10.0%	9	22.5%	23	57.5%	36	90.0%[c]
D. Mental Retardation	5	12.5%	9	22.5%	24	60.0%	38	95.0%[d]
E. Juvenile Court	4	10.0%	9	22.5%	24	60.0%	37	92.5%[e]
F. Other*	4	10.0%	—	—	36	60.0%	40	100.0%

[b] Two states (5.0%) answered "not applicable."
[c] Four states (10.0%) answered "not applicable."
[d] Two states (5.0%) answered "not applicable."
[e] Three states (7.5%) answered "not applicable."

*Other - Youth Services, Exceptional Children's Act, Division of Youth Services, Corrections

16. Areas evaluated in out-of-state facilities:

NOTE: If any categories were checked as being evaluated, the remainder unchecked for each state were considered as being not evaluated. Any answers left completely unchecked were considered "no answer" unless a "not applicable" was written in.

	Number of states that evaluate		Number of states that don't evaluate		No answer		Total	
A. Adequacy of building and structure	24	60.0%	5	12.5%	9	22.5%	38	95.0%*
B. Child maintenance (food and clothing)	24	60.0%	5	12.5%	9	22.5%	38	95.0%*
C. Child supervision	25	62.5%	4	10.0%	9	22.5%	38	95.0%*
D. Educational programs	26	65.0%	3	7.5%	9	22.5%	38	95.0%*
E. Social Services	26	65.0%	3	7.5%	9	22.5%	38	95.0%*
F. Medical Services	26	65.0%	3	7.5%	9	22.5%	38	95.0%*
G. Pychological Services	26	65.0%	3	7.5%	9	22.5%	38	95.0%*
H. Psychiatric Services	26	65.0%	3	7.5%	9	22.5%	38	95.0%*
I. Recreational Services	25	62.5%	4	10.0%	9	22.5%	38	95.0%*
J. Religious Services	22	55.0%	7	17.5%	9	22.5%	38	95.0%*
K. Comparative costs and rates	24	60.0%	5	12.5%	9	22.5%	38	95.0%*
L. Type and quality of ownership and operation	19	47.5%	10	25.0%	9	22.5%	38	95.0%*

*Questions 16A through 16L, 2 states (5.0%) indicated "not applicable."

17. Registry of evaluated and approved out-of-state facilities:

	Number	Percentage
Number of states with registries	19	47.5%
Number of states without registries	19	47.5%
No answer	2	5.0%
Total	40	100.0%

18. Evaluation units responsible for monitoring out-of-state facilities:

	Number of states with units		Number of states without units		No answer		Total	
A. Central Evaluation department	4	10.0%	9	22.5%	20	50.0%	33	82.5%[a]
B. Social Services	20	50.0%	9	22.5%	8	20.0%	37	92.5%[b]
C. Education	6	15.0%	6	15.0%	21	52.5%	33	82.5%[c]
D. Mental Hygiene	4	10.0%	7	17.5%	21	52.5%	32	80.0%[d]
E. Mental Retardation	5	12.5%	6	15.0%	21	52.5%	32	80.0%[e]
F. Juvenile Court	4	10.0%	7	17.5%	23	57.5%	34	85.0%[f]
G. Other*	5	12.5%	___	___	35	87.5%	40	100.0%

[a] Seven states (17.5%) indicated "not applicable."
[b] Three states (7.5%) indicated "not applicable."
[c] Seven states (17.5%) indicated "not applicable."
[d] Eight states (20.0%) indicated "not applicable."
[e] Eight states (20.0%) indicated "not applicable."
[f] Six states (15.0%) indicated "not applicable."

*Other - Division of Youth Services - 2 states, Children's Services, Licensing, Corrections.

19. Manner and frequency of monitoring out-of-state placements:

Manner	Frequency of monitoring by states									
	Semi-annual		Annual		Other Frequency*		No answer		Total	
A. Visits	9	22.5%	4	10.0%	7	17.5%	11	27.5%	31	77.5%[a]
B. Written reports	8	20.0%	4	10.0%	12	30.0%	10	25.0%	34	85.0%[b]
C. Correspondence	5	12.5%	2	5.0%	12	30.0%	14	35.0%	33	82.5%[c]
D. Other[d]	9	22.5%					31	77.5%	40	100.0%

*Other frequencies:

A. Visits
- Quarterly
- Very frequent
- When possible
- From semi-annually to weekly
- rarely

B. Written reports
- Quarterly
- Monthly
- Three times a year

C. Correspondence
- Quarterly
- As appropriate
- As needed
- Monthly

Seven states indicated "quarterly" for some combination of visits, written reports and correspondence. There were various combinations of the monitoring requirements listed above reported by states.

[a] Five states (12.5%) indicated no visits made.
Four states (10.0%) indicated "not applicable."

[b] Two states (5.0%) indicated no written reports made.
Four states (10.0%) indicated "not applicable."

[c] Three states (7.5%) indicated no correspondence.
Four states (10.0%) indicated "not applicable."

[d] Other manners of monitoring: Correspondence with licensing authority, client interviews, telephone calls - 2 states, initial pre-placement visit, accept other state's evaluation, interviews with child during home visits, contact with State Department of receiving state prior to placement.

20. Payments to out-of-state facilities for all services made by single unit of government:

	Number	Percentage
Number of states with single paying unit	10	25.0%
Number of states without single paying unit	28	70.0%
No answer	1	2.5%
Total	39	97.5%*

* One state (2.5%) indicated "not applicable."

See Appendix I for names of single units making payments for services.

21. Payments to out-of-state facilities made by placing units or departments:

Number of states with units making payments	33	82.5%
Number of states with units not making payments	6	15.0%
No answer	1	2.5%
Total	40	100.0%

22. Cateogories of service for which states make separate payments:

	Number of states making separate payments		Number of states not making separate payments		No answer		Total	
A. Education	14	35.0%	8	20.0%	16	40.0%	38	95.0%*
B. Maintenance	15	37.5%	12	30.0%	11	27.5%	38	95.0%*
C. All other services	9	22.5%	13	32.5%	16	40.0%	38	95.0%*
D. Medical only	16	40.0%	7	17.5%	15	37.5%	38	95.0%*
E. Psychiatric only	12	30.0%	10	25.0%	16	40.0%	38	95.0%*
F. Other[f]	3	7.5%	—	—	37	92.5%	40	100.0%

*Questions 22A through 22E, 2 states (5.0%) indicated "not applicable."

See Appendix I for names of units making separate payments for services by categories.

[f]Other - Mental retardation, Corrections - 2 states.

23. Documentation needed as conditions for out-of-state placements:

	Number of states requiring		Number of states not requiring		No answer		Total	
A. Educational classification or evaluation	25	62.5%	11	27.5%	4	10.0%	40	100.0%
B. Medical evaluation	28	70.0%	9	22.5%	3	7.5%	40	100.0%
C. Psychological evaluation	30	75.0%	7	17.5%	3	7.5%	40	100.0%
D. Substantial rejection by in-state facilities	32	80.0%	5	12.5%	3	7.5%	40	100.0%
E. Facility on approved list	27	67.5%	9	22.5%	3	7.5%	39	97.5%*
F. Provisions for financing	30	75.0%	7	17.5%	3	7.5%	40	100.0%
G. Other[g]	10	25.0%	___	___	30	75.0%	40	100.0%

*One state (2.5%) indicated "not applicable."

[g]Other - Court order, appropriateness of placement - 2 states, approval of state child care coordinator, purchase of service contract, approval by Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children, costs within acceptable limits, special needs of child, public sponsorship of placement, unavailability of "in-state" resources.

24. Title of worker and Department responsible for continuity of services and planning for return of child: see Appendix I.

25. Provisions for visits by child to home:

	Number	Percentage
Number of states making provisions	32	80.0%
Number of states not making provisions	5	12.5%
No answer	3	7.5%
Total	40	100.0%

26. Payment by state for child's transportation:

	Number	Percentage
Number of states making payment	30	75.0%
Number of states not making payment	7	17.5%
No answer	3	7.5%
Total	40	100.0%

Number of visits per year: most frequent answer was two visits reported by 4 states. Other states reported one visit, three visits, and seven visits per year. Other answers included "varies," "as indicated by treatment plan," "all vacations and holidays" or variations of these replies.

27. Provisions for visits by parent to child:

Number of states making provisions	22	55.0%
Number of states not making provisions	13	32.5%
No answer	5	12.5%
Total	40	100.0%

28. Payments for parent's transportation by state:

Number of states making payments	29	72.5%
Number of states not making payments	6	15.0%
No answer	5	12.5%
Total	40	100.0%

Number of visits per year: Most states answered "as indicated by treatment plan" or "on a case by case basis," "for unusual circumstances," "varies," or variations of these replies.

29. States satisfied with out-of-state placement system:

	Number	Percentage
Number of states satisfied	16	40.0%
Number of states not satisfied	22	55.0%
No answer	2	5.0%
Total	40	100.0%

30. Kinds of system improvements planned: see Appendix I.

Part II

1. Out-of-state children received by public facilities:

	Number	Percentage
Number of states in which public facilities accept children	9	22.5%
Number of states in which public facilities do not accept children	26	65.0%
No answer	5	12.5%
Total	40	100.0%

2. Out-of-state children received by voluntary facilities:

Number of states in which voluntary facilities accept children	37	92.5%
Number of states in which voluntary facilities do not accept children	2	5.0%
No answer	1	2.5%
Total	40	100.0%

3. Out-of-state children received by proprietary agencies:

Number of states in which proprietary agencies accept children	28	70.0%
Number of states in which proprietary agencies do not accept children	3	7.5%
No answer	3	7.5%
Total	34	85.0%*

* Six states (15.0%) indicated "not applicable."

4. Approval by central unit of placement (reception) of out-of-state children:

Number of states with central unit	24	60.0%
Number of states without central unit	15	37.5%
No answer	0	0 %
Total	39	97.5%*

* One state (2.5%) indicated "not applicable."

See Appendix I for state's names of units giving approval for placement of out-of-state children.

5. Approval of facilities receiving out-of-state children:

	Number	Percentage
Number of states requiring approval	34	85.0%
Number of states not requiring approval	6	15.0%
No answer	0	0 %
Total	40	100.0%

6. Federal Interstate Compact on Placement of out-of-state children:

	Number of states utilizing Compact in placements		Number of states not utilizing Compact in placements		No answer		Total	
A. Public facilities	16	40.0%	11	27.5%	6	15.0%	33	82.5%[a]
B. Voluntary facilities	28	70.0%	7	17.5%	4	10.0%	39	97.5%[b]
C. Proprietary facilities	18	45.0%	10	25.0%	7	17.5%	35	87.5%[c]

[a]Seven states (17.5%) indicated "not applicable."
[b]One state (2.5%) indicated "not applicable."
[c]Five states (12.5%) indicated "not applicable."

7. Central registry of out-of-state children:

	Number	Percentage
Number of states with central registry	14	35.0%
Number of states without central registry	24	60.0%
No answer	2	5.0%
Total	40	100.0%

See Appendix I for state's names for central registries.

8. Central registry responsible for assessing and/or monitoring of placement operants:

NOTE: Seventeen states did not answer any of this question. Four states indicated this question "not applicable." Because of the format of this question, answers received indicated it was understood as "assessment and/or monitoring". Percentages would be meaningless and it has been summarized in the following manner:

	Number of states with registries that assess and/or monitor
A. Appropriateness of placement	16
B. Length of time child is in placement	8
C. Continuity of contacts by child with family	6
D. Progress reports on child	13
E. Planning for return of child to home and community	12

9. Assumption of responsibility for out-of-state children:

	Number	Percentage
Number of states assuming responsibility	22	55.0%
Number of states not assuming responsibilities	16	40.0%
No answer	1	2.5%
Total	39	97.5%*

* One state (2.5%) indicated "not applicable."

10. Kinds of responsibilities assumed by states: see Appendix I.

40

11. List or register of facilities accepting out-of-state children:

	Number	Percentage
Number of states with list	8	20.0%
Number of states without list	30	75.0%
No answer	2	5.0%
Total	40	100.0%

12. States satisfied with arrangements for reception of out-of-state children:

	Number	Percentage
Number of states satisfied	18	45.0%
Number of states not satisfied	18	45.0%
No answer	3	7.5%
Total	39	97.5%*

* One state (2.5%) answered "not applicable."

13. Other arrangements planned for placement (reception) of out-of-state children: see Appendix I.

Appendix I

Data by State not Adaptable to Statistical Analysis

The following states did not reply to the Survey at all:*

Alabama	North Dakota
Connecticut	Ohio
District of Columbia	South Dakota
Florida	Texas
Mississippi	

In the compilation which follows, therfore, "no answer" indicates that the State replied to the Survey, but did not answer that particular question.

*West Virginia responded too late to be included in the report.

Appendix I

Data by State not Adaptable to Statistical Analysis

Part I of Survey Instrument

Q.4 Central unit or department responsible for all out-of-state placements

State	Name	Department of Administration
Alaska	No applicable	
Arizona	Social Service Bureau	Department of Economic Security
Arkansas	No answer	
California	No answer	
Colorado	Special Services for Children	Department of Social Services
Delaware	No answer	
Georgia	No answer	
Hawaii	No answer	
Idaho	Division of Welfare, Department of Health and Welfare	
Illinois	Interstate Compact	
Indiana	No answer	
Iowa	Bureau of out-of-home Services	Department of Social Services Division of Community Services
Kansas	Division of Children and Youth	Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services
Kentucky	Interstate Unit	
Louisiana	No answer	
Maine	No answer	
Maryland	No answer	
Massachusetts	No answer	
Michigan	No answer	
Minnesota	Social Services Division	Department of Welfare
Missouri	Division of Family Service	Department of Social Services
Montana	Not applicable	
Nebraska	Division of Social Services	Department of Public Welfare
Nevada	No answer	
New Hampshire	Bureau of Child and Family Services	Division of Welfare
New Jersey	Bureau of Residential Services	Department of Human Services
New Mexico	No answer	
North Carolina	No answer	
Oklahoma	Division of Social Services	Department of Institutions and Social Rehabilitating Services
Oregon	Children Services Division	Department of Human Resources
Pennsylvania	No answer	
Rhode Island	No answer	
South Carolina	Individual and Family Services Division	
Tennessee	Interstate and Inter-County Planning	Human Services

Q.4 Central unit or department responsible for all out-of-state placements (cont'd)

State	Name	Department of Administration
Utah	Division of Family Services	Department of Social Services
Vermont	Field Operations Unit Division of Social Services	Department of Social Rehabilitative Services
Virginia	Interstate Placements Resource Coordination	Department of Welfare
Washington	Office of Family, Children and Adult Services	Department of Health Services
Wisconsin	Not applicable	
Wyoming	Adoption Unit - State Social Services	

Q.8 Central Registry of Children Placed Out-of-State

	Name
Alaska	No answer
Arizona	Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children
Arkansas	No answer
California	No answer
Colorado	Department of Social Services list
Delaware	No answer
Georgia	No answer
Hawaii	No answer
Idaho	State Child Care Coordinator (except for Department of Education)
Illinois	Interstate Compact Unit
Indiana	No answer
Iowa	Not applicable
Kansas	Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children
Kentucky	List, but unnamed
Louisiana	Exceptional Children's Act list and Office of Family Services List
Maine	No answer
Maryland	No answer
Massachusetts	No answer
Michigan	No answer
Minnesota	No answer
Missouri	Interstate Placement Office
Montana	No answer
Nebraska	No answer
Nevada	No answer
New Hampshire	Bureau of Children and Family Services
New Jersey	Division of Youth and Family Services Computer Print Out
New Mexico	No answer
North Carolina	No answer
Oklahoma	Placement register
Oregon	No answer
Pennsylvania	No answer
Rhode Island	No answer
South Carolina	No answer
Tennessee	No answer

Q.8 Central Registry of Children Placed Out-of-State (cont'd)

	Name
Utah	Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children
Vermont	Registry in Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services
Virginia	Interstate Placement Registry
Washington	Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children
Wisconsin	Not applicable
Wyoming	Compact Regulation

Q.14 Unit or Department Evaluating all Out-of-State Placements

	Name	Department of Administration
Alaska	Not applicable	
Arizona	No answer	
Arkansas	No answer	
California	No answer	
Colorado	No answer	
Delaware	No answer	
Georgia	No answer	
Hawaii	No answer	
Idaho	Child Care Coordinator	Department of Health and Welfare
Illinois	No answer	
Indiana	No answer	
Iowa	No answer	
Kansas	Division for Children and Youth	Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services
Kentucky	Alternate Care Branch	Department of Human Resources
Louisiana	Licensing and Certification	Division of Management
Maine	No answer	
Maryland	No answer	
Massachusetts	No answer	
Michigan	No answer	
Minnesota	No answer	
Missouri	No answer	
Montana	No answer	
Nebraska	No answer	
Nevada	No answer	
New Hampshire	Bureau of Child and Family Services	Department of Welfare
New Jersey	Bureau of Residential Services Evaluation Unit	Department of Human Services
New Mexico	No answer	
North Carolina	No answer	
Oklahoma	Licensing Division of Social Services	Department of Institutions and Social Rehabilitative Services
Oregon	Mental Health Unit	Children's Services Division
Pennsylvania	No answer	
Rhode Island	No answer	
South Carolina	No answer	
Tennessee	No answer	

Q.14 Unit or Department evaluating All Out-of-State Placements (cont'd)

	Name	Department of Administration
Utah	No answer	
Vermont	No answer	
Virginia	No answer	
Washington	No answer	
Wisconsin	Administration of Division of Community Services	Department of Health and Social Services
Wyoming	Social Services	

Q.20 Single Unit or Department making Payment to Out-of-State Facilities for All Services

	Name
Alaska	No answer
Arizona	Welfare Accounting
Arkansas	No answer
California	No answer
Colorado	No answer
Delaware	No answer
Georgia	Department of Human Resources
Hawaii	No answer
Idaho	Division of Welfare - Department of Health & Welfare (except Education)
Illinois	No answer
Indiana	No answer
Iowa	Department of Social Services
Kansas	Social and Rehabilitation Services
Kentucky	Department of Human Resources
Louisiana	No answer
Maine	No answer
Maryland	No answer
Massachusetts	No answer
Michigan	No answer
Minnesota	No answer
Missouri	Not applicable
Montana	No answer
Nebraska	No answer
Nevada	No answer
New Hampshire	No answer
New Jersey	No answer
New Mexico	No answer
North Carolina	No answer
Oklahoma	No answer
Oregon	No answer
Pennsylvania	No answer
Rhode Island	No answer
South Carolina	Department of Social Services
Tennessee	No answer
Utah	Division of Family Services
Vermont	Pre-Audit Unit, Agency for Human Services
Virginia	Not applicable (Local welfare departments)
Washington	Disbursement Section, Administrative Services Division, Department of Social and Health Services

Q.20 Single Unit or Department Making Payment to Out-of-State Facilities for All Services

	Name
Wisconsin	Not applicable
Wyoming	Social Services

Q.22 Units or Departments making Separate Payments for Categories of Services*

	Name
Alaska	Not applicable
Arizona	Medical - Department of Economic Security
Arkansas	Maintenance and Medical - Social Services
California	No answer
Colorado	No answer
Delaware	Education - Department of Public Instruction; Psychiatric - Division of Mental Health; All other services - Division of Social Services; Other - Division of Juvenile Corrections
Georgia	All other services - Division of Social Service and Youth Services; Psychiatric - Department of Mental Health
Hawaii	Maintenance - DSSH - Public Welfare Division
Idaho	Education - local school districts
Illinois	No answer
Indiana	Education - County General Fund
Iowa	Education - Department of Public Instruction; Maintenance, All other services, Medical and Psychiatric - Department of Social Services
Kansas	No answer
Kentucky	Not applicable
Louisiana	Education - Exceptional Children's Act
Maine	Education - Department of Education and Cultural Services; Maintenance and Psychiatric - Department of Mental Health and Corrections
Maryland	Maintenance - Social Services Administration or Juvenile Services Administration; All other services - Mental Retardation Administration
Massachusetts	No answer
Michigan	Medical and Psychiatric only - Title XIX
Minnesota	No answer
Missouri	Maintenance - Division of Family Services; Medical - Title XX, Department of Medical Services
Montana	Education - Department of Education; Medical and Psychiatric - Medical Assistance, Title XIX
Nebraska	No answer
Nevada	Education, Maintenance, All other services - Welfare Department; Medical and Psychiatric - Welfare Department, Medical Care Unit
New Hampshire	No answer
New Jersey	Education - Local Department of Education; Maintenance - Division of Family and Youth Services; Medical - Medicaid
New Mexico	Other - Social Services Agency pays for all services

*Some states supplied only selected information regarding service categories.

Q.22 Units or Departments making Separate Payments for Categories of Services (cont'd)

	Name
North Carolina	Education - Public Instruction; Maintenance, all other services, Medical and Psychiatric - Social Services
Oklahoma	No answer
Oregon	Education and Maintenance and all other services - Children's Services Division; Medical - Adult and Family Services
Pennsylvania	No answer
Rhode Island	Medical - State Medicaid Program
South Carolina	Maintenance and Medical - Department of Social Services
Tennessee	Maintenance - Human Services
Utah	No answer
Vermont	Education - Department of Education; Medical and Psychiatric - Department of Medicaid
Virginia	Education - Department of Education; Medical - Medicaid
Washington	Maintenance, All other services, Medical and Psychiatric - Disbursement Unit, Administrative Services Division
Wisconsin	No answer
Wyoming	Education, Maintenance, All other services, Medical and Psychiatric - Department of Social Services

Q.24 Title of Worker and Department responsible for (1) continuity of services to child and family and (2) planning and return of children*

	Worker	Department
Alaska	District Level Worker	District Department
Arizona	Probation Officer - Social Service Worker	Juvenile Probation - Department of Economic Security
Arkansas	Social Service Specialist	Social Services
California	No answer	
Colorado	Case social worker	County Department
Delaware	No answer	
Georgia	Services worker	Department of Human Resources
Hawaii	Social Service Worker	DSSH - Public Welfare Division
Idaho	Child Care Coordinator State and Regional	Department of Health and Welfare
Illinois	No answer	
Indiana	Caseworker and Supervisor	Placing agency or County Department of Public Welfare
Iowa	Local level Social Services Worker	Department of Social Services
Kansas	Service Worker	Social and Rehabilitation Services
Kentucky	Community Services Worker	Department for Human Services
Louisiana	Out-of-State Liaison and Family Worker	Exceptional Children's Act Office of Family Services
Maine	No answer	

*Titles and Department names identical in every instance for both services except Wyoming.

Q.24 Title of Worker and Department responsible for (1) continuity of services to child and family and (2) planning and return of children (cont'd)

	Worker	Department
Maryland	Social Worker Child Welfare Supervisor	Local departments of social services
Massachusetts	CORE Chairperson Social Worker	Local education departments Department of Public Welfare; Department of Youth Services
Michigan	Foster Care Service Worker	Local department of social services
Minnesota	No answer	local agencies
Missouri	Social Services Worker	Division of Family Services
Montana	County Social Worker	Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services; Social Services Bureau
Nebraska	No answer	
Nevada	Social Worker	Welfare Department
New Hampshire	Social Worker	Department of Welfare
New Jersey	Caseworker	Division of Youth and Family Services
New Mexico	Social Worker	Social Services agency
North Carolina	Social Worker	County Department of Social Services
Oklahoma	Social Worker	
Oregon	Caseworker	Children's Services Division
Pennsylvania	No answer	
Rhode Island	Social Worker	local departments
South Carolina	The Department of Social Services (no answer)	
Tennessee	Social Counselor	Human Services
Utah	Social Worker	Division of Family Services
Vermont	Social Worker	Social and Rehabilitation Services
Virginia	Protective Social Worker	Local welfare agency
Washington	Caseworker	Department of Social and Health Services
Wisconsin	County Social Worker	Department of Social Services
Wyoming	Social Worker	(1) continuity of services - Family Services Unit; (2) planning and return of children - Child Protective Unit

Q.30 Improvements Planned for Out-of-State Placement System -

	Improvements
Alaska	No answer
Arizona	Computerized child tracking system to provide updated information on all purchased services, including out-of-state placements, foster care, residential placements
Arkansas	No answer
California	No answer
Colorado	No answer
Delaware	No answer
Georgia	Better monitoring of facilities and services; better payment system
Hawaii	No answer
Idaho	Development of local programs; closer screening of placements
Illinois	No answer
Indiana	Enabling legislation for Compact

Q.30 Improvements Planned for Out-of-State Placement System (cont'd)

	Improvements
Iowa	Develop local programs; better monitoring and supervision of placements
Kansas	No answer
Kentucky	Develop in-state resources
Louisiana	Curtailment of out-of-state placements
Maine	Develop one unit to handle all out-of-state placements
Maryland	Inter-agency team evaluation system
Massachusetts	No answer
Michigan	No answer
Minnesota	Task Force working on system
Missouri	Overhaul of system
Montana	Team evaluation and monitoring; contractual agreements
Nebraska	No answer
Nevada	Development of in-state facilities
New Hampshire	No answer
New Jersey	No answer
New Mexico	Develop local resources
North Carolina	Thorough evaluation and monitoring of facilities; on-site visits
Oklahoma	Education and training of public staff and facilities' staffs in procedures
Oregon	Develop registry of resources, funding and interstate communication
Pennsylvania	Central registry and tracking system
Rhode Island	Evaluation and monitoring unit
South Carolina	Enabling legislation for Compact; consolidation of placement responsibilities
Tennessee	No answer
Utah	Integration of services
Vermont	No answer
Virginia	Coordination of effort; utilization of in-state resources
Washington	No answer
Wisconsin	Enabling legislation for Compact
Wyoming	No answer

Part II of Survey Instrument

Q.4 Unit or Department approving Placement of Out-of-State Children

	Name
Alaska	Interstate Compact Administrator
Arizona	Department of Economic Security; Social Services Bureau
Arkansas	No answer
California	Department of Health for Interstate Compact for the Placement of Children states only
Colorado	Special Services, Title XX, Department of Social Services
Delaware	Division of Social Services, Interstate Compact Administration
Georgia	Interstate Placement Unit
Hawaii	No answer
Idaho	No answer
Illinois	Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children

Q.4 Unit or Department approving Placement of Out-of-State Children (cont'd)

	Name
Indiana	State Department of Public Welfare, Mental Health, and State Department of Corrections
Iowa	Interstate Compact Unit
Kansas	Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children
Kentucky	Interstate Unit
Louisiana	Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children
Maine	No answer
Maryland	Interstate Compact, Social Services Administration
Massachusetts	No answer
Michigan	Department of Social Services, Placement Services Division
Minnesota	Department of Welfare
Missouri	Division of Family Services
Montana	Not applicable
Nebraska	Department of Public Welfare, Compact Administration
Nevada	No answer
New Hampshire	Bureau of Child and Family Services
New Jersey	No answer
New Mexico	Not applicable
North Carolina	No answer
Oklahoma	Licensing
Oregon	No answer
Pennsylvania	Not applicable
Rhode Island	No answer
South Carolina	No answer
Tennessee	No answer
Utah	Division of Family Services
Vermont	Social and Rehabilitation Services
Virginia	Interstate Placement and Resource Coordination
Washington	Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children
Wisconsin	No answer
Wyoming	Social Services

Q.7 Central Registry of Out-of-State Children

	Name
Alaska	No answer
Arizona	Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children
Arkansas	No answer
California	No answer
Colorado	No answer
Delaware	Division of Social Services, Interstate Compact Administration
Georgia	No answer
Hawaii	No answer
Idaho	No answer
Illinois	Interstate Compact
Indiana	Department of Public Welfare
Iowa	Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children
Kansas	Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children
Kentucky	Interstate Unit list
Louisiana	No answer

Q.7 Central Registry of Out-of-State Children (cont'd)

	Name
Maine	No answer
Maryland	Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children
Massachusetts	No answer
Michigan	Department of Social Services, Placement Services Division
Minnesota	No answer
Missouri	Interstate Placement Office
Montana	Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children
Nebraska	No answer
Nevada	No answer
New Hampshire	Not applicable
New Jersey	No answer
New Mexico	No answer
North Carolina	No answer
Oklahoma	Custody Review and Interstate Placement
Oregon	No answer
Pennsylvania	Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children
Rhode Island	No answer
South Carolina	No answer
Tennessee	No answer
Utah	Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children
Vermont	No answer
Virginia	Interstate Placement Register
Washington	Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children
Wisconsin	No answer
Wyoming	Compact Regulation

Q.10 Responsibilities assumed by States for Out-of-State Children

	Responsibilities
Alaska	Not applicable
Arizona	No answer
Arkansas	Technical assistance, licensing, written reports to agency responsible for child
California	No answer
Colorado	No answer
Delaware	No answer
Georgia	No answer
Hawaii	No answer
Idaho	Licensing all facilities, evaluation and supervision of Compact placed children
Illinois	No answer
Indiana	Planning for return of children
Iowa	Evaluation and problem solving upon request of Compact states or voluntary placing agencies
Kansas	Supervision of placements, licensing facilities, reports
Kentucky	Maintaining of standards through licensing and evaluation
Louisiana	No answer
Maine	Licensing, communication link with sending agency
Maryland	No answer
Massachusetts	Licensing

Q.10 Responsibilities assumed by States for Out-of-State Children (cont'd)

	Responsibilities
Michigan	Courtesy supervision of placements
Minnesota	Service only
Missouri	Supervision and protective services arrangements for travel, education and medical services
Montana	Courtesy supervision, monitoring placements
Nebraska	No answer
Nevada	No answer
New Hampshire	No answer
New Jersey	No answer
New Mexico	Supervision and casework support
North Carolina	Licensing
Oklahoma	No answer
Oregon	No answer
Pennsylvania	Supervision
Rhode Island	No answer
South Carolina	Evaluation of facilities and supervision
Tennessee	No answer
Utah	No answer
Vermont	Supervision
Virginia	Evaluation, supervision and monitoring
Washington	Supervision and monitoring
Wisconsin	No answer
Wyoming	Supervision

Q.13 Other Arrangements Planned for Reception of Out-of-State Children

	Arrangements
Alaska	Not applicable
Arizona	Not applicable
Arkansas	Enabling legislation to join Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children
California	Not applicable
Colorado	Registry of placements and monitoring system
Delaware	No answer
Georgia	Training and education of public staff and facilities' staff in procedures
Hawaii	No answer
Idaho	No answer
Illinois	No answer
Indiana	Coordination and regulation of all placements
Iowa	No answer
Kansas	No answer
Kentucky	Enforce strict adherence to Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children
Louisiana	No answer
Maine	No answer
Maryland	Better administration of Compact procedures and monitoring of facilities
Massachusetts	No answer
Michigan	Enactment of enabling legislation on Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children

Q.13 Other Arrangements Planned for Reception of Out-of-State Children (cont'd)

	Arrangements
Minnesota	No answer
Missouri	No answer
Montana	No answer
Nebraska	No answer
Nevada	Not applicable
New Hampshire	No answer
New Jersey	No answer
New Mexico	Not applicable
North Carolina	Compact procedures to include mentally ill and retarded
Oklahoma	No answer
Oregon	Central Registry
Pennsylvania	Central Registry and tracking system
Rhode Island	No answer
South Carolina	Enactment of enabling legislation on Compact, consolidation of placement responsibilities
Tennessee	No answer
Utah	Centralized control over placements
Vermont	No answer
Virginia	Regulation of facilities through coordination of licensing agency efforts
Washington	No answer
Wisconsin	Enabling legislation for Compact
Wyoming	No answer

NEW YORK STATE COUNCIL OF VOLUNTARY CHILD CARE AGENCIES
104 East 35th Street, New York, N. Y. 10016
176 Washington Avenue, Albany, N. Y. 12210

The Survey Instrument

August 2, 1977

To Whom it may concern:

New York State is becoming increasingly concerned about the growing numbers of children who are being placed in residential child care facilities outside its borders. These children are being placed out-of-state for a range of services including educational, physical and psychiatric containment and remediation not thought to be appropriately available within New York.

The New York State Council of Voluntary Child Care Agencies, a membership organization comprised of more than 120 voluntary agencies, which care for 28,000 New York State children, is endeavoring to gather information from other states regarding their procedures in handling similar out-of-state placements of children.

Although our main interest lies in learning about procedures for placing children out-of-state, we are also interested in learning about the responsibilities states assume regarding children placed in their facilities by other states.

Attached is a two-part questionnaire. The major questions are in Part I and concern procedures governing placement of children in facilities outside their home states. Part II covers procedures and responsibilities of states for children placed in their facilities by other states. A definition of terms and instructions for answering questions is enclosed.

Several groups in New York are presently involved in studying these issues. We are hopeful the information you provide will contribute to our fund of knowledge in this matter and lead to change and improvements in procedures and ultimately in the care of the children. We are therefore asking you to complete and return this questionnaire as quickly as possible, in any event, not later than October 10, 1977. (If another person could more appropriately fill out this questionnaire, please send it on to him/her). A stamped self-addressed envelope is enclosed as well as a copy of testimony NYSCOVCCA recently presented on the issues involved.

Thank you for your efforts and attention in this matter.

Yours truly,

Adeline Bliven
Staff Assistant

AB:bfs

NEW YORK STATE COUNCIL OF VOLUNTARY CHILD CARE AGENCIES
104 East 35th Street, New York, N. Y. 10016
176 Washington Avenue, Albany, N. Y. 12210

Out-of-State Placement Questionnaire

Instructions:

Please answer questions with a check (✓) whereever possible. Give names of units and registries where requested and the names of governmental units to which they are responsible (Department of Administration). Please give data valid as of July 1, 1977.

Different states have different names for state service provision agencies. Therefore, we have tried to list general terms to designate state departments. Please choose the term which best describes the type of service your relevant state agency provides. Please specify under "other" any state agency or unit which does not fit into any of the categories we have listed. Please fill out as many of the questions as apply to your state. If any question is inappropriate or not applicable in terms of your state please so note.

If the entire form is inapplicable please so note and return anyhow as we would like to have every state represented and accounted for.

By "Out-of-State Placement" we mean placement in a residential group care facility providing a range of services.

By "unit" we mean any part of government; e.g., a department, a division, an office, a bureau.

_____ _____
Name of person filling out questionnaire State

_____
Title

_____
Address

_____

I would like a copy of the results.

Yes _____ No _____

Out-of-State Placement Questionnaire

Part I

1. Is your state a party to the Federal Interstate Compact on the Placement of children?

   Yes _____ No _____

2. Does your state use the Compact procedures in arranging for out-of-state placements of children?

   Yes _____ No _____

3. Does your state use the Compact procedures in arranging for the return of children from out-of-state placements?

   Yes _____ No _____

4. Is there a central unit of government which has responsibility for approving all out-of-state placements?

   Yes _____ No _____ If "yes" please give:

   Name of Unit _____

   Department which administers such unit, if any _____

5. If central approval is not needed for some out-of-state placements do the Departments listed below place children on their own authority?

Social Services	Yes _____	No _____
Education	Yes _____	No _____
Mental Hygiene	Yes _____	No _____
Mental Retardation	Yes _____	No _____
Juvenile Court	Yes _____	No _____
Other (specify)	Yes _____	No _____

6. Do voluntary (not-for-profit) agencies place children in out-of-state facilities?

   Yes _____ No _____

7. Do proprietary (profit-making) agencies place children in out-of-state facilities?

   Yes _____ No _____

8. Is there a Central Registry of all children placed out-of-state?

   Yes _____ No _____

   Name of Central Registry_____

9. Does this Central Registry monitor the following?

Appropriateness of placement	Yes _____	No _____
Length of placement	Yes _____	No _____
Planning for return of children home	Yes _____	No _____
Other	Yes _____	No _____

10. Do the Departments listed below maintain registries on children they place in out-of-state facilities?

Social Services	Yes _____	No _____
Education	Yes _____	No _____
Mental Hygiene	Yes _____	No _____
Mental Retardation	Yes _____	No _____
Juvenile Court	Yes _____	No _____
Other	Yes _____	No _____

11. Do voluntary and proprietary agencies maintain registries on children they place in out-of-state facilities?

Voluntary	Yes _____	No _____
Proprietary	Yes _____	No _____

12. Please indicate the number of children in placement in out-of-state facilities by handicapping conditions.

	# of children	Unknown	Not Applicable
Mental Retardation (below 80 I.Q.)	_____	_____	_____
Physically Handicapped	_____	_____	_____
Neurologically Handicapped	_____	_____	_____
Emotionally Disturbed	_____	_____	_____
Socially Maladjusted	_____	_____	_____
Other (Specify)	_____	_____	_____
Multiple Handicaps	_____	_____	_____
TOTAL	_____	_____	_____

13. Indicate the number of children in care.

Less than one year	_____	_____	_____
Less than two years	_____	_____	_____
Less than three years	_____	_____	_____
More than three years	_____	_____	_____

14. Is there one unit of government responsible for evaluating all out-of-state placement facilities?

Yes _____ No _____ If "yes" please give:

Name of Unit _____ _____

Department which administers unit, if any _____

15. Do any or all of the Departments listed below make evaluations of out-of-state facilities they utilize?

Social Services	Yes _____	No _____
Education	Yes _____	No _____
Mental Hygiene	Yes _____	No _____
Mental Retardation	Yes _____	No _____
Juvenile Court	Yes _____	No _____
Other (specify)		

16. Please indicate by a check the areas that are evaluated in out-of-state facilities.

Adequacy of building and structure _____

Child maintenance (food and clothing) _____

Child supervision _____

Education programs _____

Social services _____

Medical services _____

Psychological services _____

Psychiatric services _____

Recreational services _____

Religious services _____

Comparative costs and rates _____

Type and quality of ownership and operation _____

17. Do you keep a registry of evaluated and approved out-of-state facilities?

Yes _____ No _____

18. Are the units responsible for evaluating out-of-state facilities also responsible for monitoring these facilities?

Central evaluation department	Yes _____	No _____
Social Services	Yes _____	No _____
Education	Yes _____	No _____
Mental Hygiene	Yes _____	No _____
Mental Retardation	Yes _____	No _____
Juvenile Court	Yes _____	No _____
Other (specify)		

19. Please indicate by a check the manner in which monitoring is done and how often it occurs.

	Manner	Frequency		
		Semi Annual	Annual	Other (Indicate)
Visits	_____	_____	_____	_____
Written reports	_____	_____	_____	_____
Correspondence	_____	_____	_____	_____
Other (explain)	_____	_____	_____	_____

20. Are payments for all services provided by out-of-state facilities made by a single unit of government?

Yes _____ No _____

Name of Unit _____

21. Are payments to out-of-state facilities made by the units or departments that make the placement?

Yes _____ No _____

22. Are separate payments made to out-of-state facilities for the service categories listed below? Give the name of the unit of government making such payments.

Education	Yes _____	No _____	Name of Unit _____
Maintenance	Yes _____	No _____	Name of Unit _____
All other services	Yes _____	No _____	Name of Unit _____
Medical only	Yes _____	No _____	Name of Unit _____
Psychiatric only	Yes _____	No _____	Name of Unit _____

Other (specify)

23. Please indicate which of the following are needed as a condition of out-of-state placement for a particular child.

Educational Classification or Evaluation	_____
Medical Evaluation	_____
Psychological Evaluation	_____
Substantial rejection by in-state facilities	_____
Facility is on approved list	_____
Provisions for financing	_____
Other (specify)	_____

24. Please indicate the title of the worker and his/her department which is responsible for the services listed below.

	Title of Worker	Department
Continuity of services to child and family	_____	_____
Planning for return of child to home and community	_____	_____

25. Are provisions made for visits by the child to his/her home and/or community?

    Yes _____ No _____

26. Do you pay for transportation?

    Yes _____ No _____

    How many visits per year? _____

27. Are provisions made for visits by parents to the child in placement?

    Yes _____ No _____

28. Do you pay for transportation for such visits?

    Yes _____ No _____

    How many visits per year? _____

29. Do you feel your out-of-state placement system is satisfactory?

    Yes _____ No _____

30. If "no" please indicate below what alternate measures you are planning, and how you feel they will improve your system.

Out-of-State Placement Questionnaire

Part II

_____ _____

Name of person filling out questionnaire State

_____

Title

_____

Address

_____

I would like a copy of the results.

Yes _____ No _____

---

1. Do you accept children from other states into public (tax-supported) facilities in your state?

   Yes _____ No _____

2. Are children from other states accepted by voluntary facilities in your state?

   Yes _____ No _____

3. Are children from other states accepted by proprietary facilities in your state?

   Yes _____ No _____

4. Must placements of out-of-state children in residential group care facilities within your state be approved by some unit of government?

   Yes _____ No _____

   Name of unit or department _____

5. Must the facilities accepting out-of-state children be approved by your state?

   Yes _____ No _____

6. Does your state use the Interstate Compact procedures in arrangements made for out-of-state children being placed in facilities within your state?

   a. Public facilities — Yes _____ No _____

   b. Voluntary — Yes _____ No _____

   c. Proprietary — Yes _____ No _____

7. Is there a Central Registry kept of all children from other states placed in residential group care facilities within your state?

   Yes _____ No _____

   Name of Registry _____

8. Is this registry responsible for assessing and monitoring the following information?

	Assessment	Monitoring
Appropriateness of placement	_____	_____
Length of time child is in placement	_____	_____
Continuity of contacts by child with family	_____	_____
Progress reports on child	_____	_____
Planning for return of child to home and community	_____	_____

9. Does your state assume any responsibility for the out-of-state children accepted by facilities within your state?

   Yes _____ No _____

10. Please list below the kinds of responsibilities your state assumes for these children.

11. Do you have a list of facilities which accept out-of-state children? (Please attach to this questionnaire when returning it)

    Yes _____ No _____

12. Are the present arrangements for receiving children from out-of-state satisfactory to your state?

    Yes _____ No _____

13. If the above answer is "no" please indicate below what changes you are planning to make and how you feel these changes will improve your present arrangements.

NEW YORK STATE
COUNCIL OF VOLUNTARY CHILD CARE AGENCIES
MEMBER AGENCIES

Abbott House
Albany Diocesan Health and Social Services
Andrus Children's Home
Angel Guardian Home
Argus Youth, Inc.
Astor Home for Children
Baker Hall
Berkshire Farm Center and Services for Youth
Big Brothers Inc. of New York City
Brooklyn Bureau of Community Service
Brooklyn Home for Children
Brooklyn Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children
Brookwood Child Care
Buffalo Boys Town, Inc.
Cardinal Hayes Home for Children
Cardinal McCloskey School and Home for Children
Catholic Charities, Archdiocese of New York
Catholic Charities, Diocese of Brooklyn
Catholic Charities of Buffalo
Catholic Child Care Society, Diocese of Brooklyn
Catholic Guardian Society, Archdiocese of New York
Catholic Guardian Society, Diocese of Brooklyn
Catholic Home Bureau
Catholic Social Services
Cayuga Home for Children
Charlton School
Children's Aid Society
Children's Health Service
Children's Home of Jefferson County
Children's Home of Kingston
Children's Home of Poughkeepsie
Children's Home of Schenectady
Children's Home of Wyoming Conference
Children's Receiving Home of Westchester
Children's Village
Convalescent Hospital for Children
Edwin Gould Services for Children
Elmcrest Children's Center
Family Service of Westchester, Inc.
Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York
Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies
Friendly Homes
Gateway United Methodist Youth Center
George Junior Republic
Girls Town of the Florence Crittenton League
Graham-Windham Services to Families and Children
Green Chimneys Children's Services
Greer-Woodycrest Children's Services
Gustavus Adolphus Children's Home
Harmony Heights Girls Residence
Heartsease Home, Inc.
Hillside Children's Center
Home Health-Homemaker Services - GHI
Hope for Youth, Inc.
Hopevale, Inc.
House of the Good Shepherd
Immaculate Heart of Mary Children's Home
Inwood House
Jewish Board of Family and Children's Services
Jewish Child Care Association
Kinship Group Home Program, Inc.
La Salle School
Lakeside School
Leake and Watts Children's Home, Inc.
Lincoln Hall
Little Flower Children's Services, Inc.
Longview
Louise Wise Services
Lutheran Community Services, Inc.
Madonna Heights School for Girls
McMahon Services for Children
McQuade Foundation
Melville House, Inc.
Mercy Home for Children
Mishkon B'nai Yisroel
Mission of the Immaculate Virgin
Nassau House, Inc.
New Life Homes - Snell Farm
New York Foundling Hospital*
Ohel Children's Home
Ottilie Home for Children
Our Lady of Victory Infant Home
Parkhurst Children's Shelter
Parsons Child and Family Center
Pius XII School
Queensboro Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children
Randolph Children's Home
Riverdale Children's Association
Saint Anne Institute
Saint Barnabas House
Saint Cabrini Home
Saint Catherine's Center for Children
St. Christopher's Home
St. Christopher's - Jennie Clarkson Child Care Services
St. Colman's Home
St. Dominic's Home
St. Francis Homes for Boys and Girls
St. Germaine's Home
St. John's Residence and School for Boys
St. Joseph Children's Services
St. Joseph's Home of Peekskill
St. Joseph's Villa of Rochester, Inc.
St. Mary of the Angels Home
St. Michael's Services for Children
St. Peter's School
St. Vincent's Hall, Inc.
Salvation Army - Services to Children
Salvation Army Friendship House
Samaritan Shelters, Inc.
Sheltering Arms Children's Service
Sisters of the Good Shepherd Residences
Society for Seamen's Children
Spence-Chapin Services to Families and Children
Summit Children's Residence Center
Talbot Perkins Children's Services
Vanderheyden Hall, Inc.
Wartburg Home of the Evangelical Lutheran Church
Wayside Home and School for Girls
Wyndham Lawn Home for Children

Lieutenant Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr. Home

* Also includes St. Agatha Home for Children